

REMARKS

The only rejection in the Action is of claims 3 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12, 13, 15-17 and 19 are allowed.

The position of the Office in the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, rejection is believed to be that the specification, while being enabling for forming the columnar structure in the film (as recited in claims 3 and 14) when sputtering (or reactive deposition or vacuum deposition) is employed, does not reasonably provide enablement for forming said columnar structure when liquid phase deposition methods are employed.

The Office has noted in the Action that the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection can be overcome by deleting "liquid phase" from claims 1 and 12 or, alternatively, by deleting the chemical vapor deposition, spraying and plating methods from claims 4 and "14" (claim "19" appears to be intended).

Applicants note that it is not clear why deleting the liquid phase methods from claims 4 and 19 will avoid the rejection of claims 3 and 14 since claims 1 and 12 on which claims 3 and 14 depend will still recite liquid phase methods. Therefore, applicants have amended the claims to delete "liquid phase" from

claims 1 and 12 and to delete "a spraying method, a plating method" from claims 4 and 19.

Although the Office suggests deleting the chemical vapor deposition method from claims 4 and 19, this method has not been deleted from these claims because chemical vapor deposition is not a liquid phase method for depositing a thin film on a substrate. Chemical vapor deposition, by definition, deposits a thin film from a vapor phase.

The amendments to the claims are believed to avoid the reasons for the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, rejection. Removal of the rejection and a notice of allowability are in order.

The foregoing is believed to be a complete and proper response to the Office Action dated November 1, 2004, and is believed to place this application in condition for allowance. If, however, minor issues remain that can be resolved by means of a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

In the event that this paper is not considered to be timely filed, applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fee for any such extension may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 111833.

PATENT APPLN. NO. 10/056,209
RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116

**PATENT
FINAL**

In the event any additional fees are required, please also
charge our Deposit Account No. 111833.

Respectfully submitted,

KUBOVCIK & KUBOVCIK



Ronald J. Kubovcik
Reg. No. 25,401

Atty. Case No. MAM-010
The Farragut Building
Suite 710
900 17th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
Tel: (202) 887-9023
Fax: (202) 887-9093
RJK/jaa